

1 determination was issued on June 17, 1998. The Director concluded that Appellant's position was
2 properly allocated. On July 9, 1998, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with
3 the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this hearing.

4
5 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant takes exception to the Director's determination
6 which distinguishes the responsibilities of a supervisor in the OT2 class specification as "clinical
7 supervision" while describing the responsibilities of a supervisor in the OT3 specification as
8 "personnel-type" supervision. Appellant argues that the OT3 specification describes primarily
9 clinical duties but that Respondent has chosen to apply a definition of supervisor which changes a
10 primarily clinical position into a position that is administrative and supervisory in nature. Appellant
11 asserts that the supervisory responsibilities referred to in the OT3 job specification are clinical in
12 nature and that his current duties are best described by the OT3 classification. Appellant takes
13 exception to the director's determination that his duties are best described by the class specification
14 of Occupational Therapist 2.

15
16 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the supervision Appellant
17 performs is "clinical" supervision of the work performed by certified occupational therapy
18 assistants. Respondent contends that Appellant's clinical supervision includes professional
19 oversight of the work being performed by therapy assistants and is required by law. Respondent
20 argues that Appellant is not responsible for hiring, training, evaluating or implementing corrective
21 action of these employees. Respondent asserts that the definition of OT3 requires that the
22 incumbents directs "occupational therapy programs and supervises therapy staff." Respondent
23 argues that the "supervises therapy staff" portion of the definition clarifies that the position is
24 responsible for supervisory responsibilities as defined in WAC 356-05-400. Respondent argues that
25 the definition for the class of OT2 requires that the incumbents participate "in therapy programs in

1 an institution or rehabilitation center, supervising an Occupational Therapist 1,” which is
2 interpreted as clinical supervision only.

3
4 Respondent also argues that Western State Hospital (WSH) organizes its occupational therapy staff
5 in such a way that the class of OT3 is no longer germane to its operation. WSH employs a
6 Therapies Supervisor to perform personnel supervision of its occupational therapy staff and does
7 not utilize the class of OT3.

8
9 Respondent argues that Appellant’s duties are encompassed by the OT2 and that the Director’s
10 determination should be affirmed.

11
12 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director’s determination that Appellant’s position is properly
13 allocated to the Occupational Therapist 2 classification should be affirmed.

14
15 **Relevant Classifications.** Occupational Therapist 2, class code 57220 and Occupational Therapist
16 3, class code 57240.

17
18 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
19 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
20 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
21 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
22 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
23 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
24 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
25 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1
2 Position allocations are “based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
3 performed and other information and recommendations.” (WAC 356-20-200). Because a current
4 and accurate description of a position’s duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved
5 classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for allocation of a
6 position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as
7 documented in the CQ.

8
9 WAC 356-05-400 which defines a supervisor as follows:

10
11 Any employee assigned responsibility by management to participate in all the
12 following functions with respect to their subordinate employees: (1) Selection of
13 staff, (2) training and development, (3) planning and assignment of work, (4)
14 evaluation of performance, and (5) corrective action. Participation in these
15 functions must not be of a merely routine nature but requires the exercise of
16 individual judgment.

17 We have carefully reviewed the classification specifications for Occupational Therapist 2 and 3 and
18 while the definitions are not clearly written, we conclude that the intent of the classes is different.
19 The OT2 classification requires incumbents to supervise an Occupational Therapist 1 and one of the
20 typical work statements clarifies that this is supervision “of therapeutic work.” Conversely, the
21 classification specification for the OT3 includes in the definition that incumbents supervise
22 “occupational therapy staff.” This definition specifies that the supervision of staff is more than just
23 clinical in nature. Based on information contained in his CQ, Appellant “provides clinical
24 supervision” of certified occupational therapy assistants. Appellant does not perform any of the
25 supervisory responsibilities outlined in WAC 356-05-400. Appellant’s duties are best described by
26 the Occupational Therapist 2 classification.

1 **Conclusion.** Appellant's position is properly classified as an Occupational Therapist 2, and his
2 appeal should be denied. The determination of the Director, dated June 17, 1998, should be
3 affirmed and adopted.

4
5 **ORDER**

6 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of David Holmes is denied and
7 the attached determination of the Director, dated June 17, 1998, is affirmed and adopted.

8
9 DATED this _____ day of _____, 1999.

10
11 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

12
13 _____
14 Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

15 _____
16 Nathan S. Ford Jr., Vice Chair

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504